



1636

PTO/SB/21 (08-00)  
Approved for use through 10/31/2002. OMB 0651-0031  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

# TRANSMITTAL FORM

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Application Number	10/005,983
Filing Date	November 7, 2001
First Named Inventor	Keith D. Allen
Group Art Unit	1636
Examiner Name	Celine X. Qian
Attorney Docket Number	R-517

Total Number of Pages in This Submission

## ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)

- |   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form<br><input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amendment / Reply - Restriction Requirement<br><input type="checkbox"/> After Final<br><input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request<br><input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request<br><input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement<br><input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application<br><input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53 | <input type="checkbox"/> Assignment Papers (for an Application)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers<br><input type="checkbox"/> Petition<br><input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application<br><input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address<br><input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer<br><input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund<br><input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to Group<br><input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences<br><input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information<br><input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter<br><input type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below): |
|---|---|--|

Remarks

RECEIVED

MAR 18 2003

TECH CENTER 1600/2000

## SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm or Individual name	Kelly L. Quast, Reg. No. 52,141
Signature	<i>Kelly L. Quast</i>
Date	March 10, 2003

## CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231 on this date: 3-10-03

Typed or printed name	Deborah A. Mojarro		
Signature	<i>Deborah A. Mojarro</i>	Date	March 10, 2003

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take 0.2 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you are required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

#9

Applicant: **Keith D. ALLEN *et al.***

Serial No.: **10/005,983**

Filed: **November 7, 2001**

Title: **Transgenic Mice Containing PERK  
Protein Kinase Gene Disruptions**

Group Art Unit: **1636**

Examiner: **Qian, Celine X.**

Customer No. **26619**

Docket/Order No. **R-517**

Date: **March 10, 2003**

**RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

**RECEIVED**

Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

MAR 18 2003

TECH CENTER 1600/2900

Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed February 11, 2003, concerning the Examiner's restrictions, Applicants hereby provisionally elect, with traverse, Invention I (claims 1-10, 12 and 14-22), drawn to a PERK targeting vector, a method of making said vector, a PERK gene knockout animal, cells isolated from said animal, and a method of making said animal.

In the restriction, the Examiner asserts that claims 1-24 are drawn to six distinct subjects, grouped as: Invention I (claims 1-10, 12 and 14-22), drawn to a PERK targeting vector, a method of making said vector, a PERK gene knockout animal, cells isolated from said animal, and a method of making said animal; Invention II (claim 11), drawn to a method of identifying an agent that regulates PERK expression by using a PERK knockout cell; Invention III (claim 11), drawn to a method of identifying an agent that regulates PERK function by using a PERK knockout cell; Invention IV (claim 13), drawn to an agent that regulates the expression or function of PERK; Invention V (claim 23), drawn to an agent that ameliorates a phenotype of the PERK knockout mouse; and Invention VI (claims 24 and 25), drawn to an agonist or an antagonist of PERK. Applicants respectfully traverse the requirement for restriction and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the requirement.

As stated in MPEP §803, the requirements for a proper claim restriction are as follows: "(a) the inventions must be independent or distinct as claimed; and (b) there must be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is required."

A proper claim restriction must place a “serious burden” on the Examiner if the claims were examined without a restriction. In order to establish a serious burden, the Examiner must “show by appropriate explanation one of the following: separate classification thereof, a separate status in the art, or a different field of search.” This showing of a serious burden is required even if the claimed inventions have been shown to be distinct. See MPEP §808.02

The instant Office Action generally asserts that restriction is warranted between Inventions I through VI in that the claimed inventions are patentably distinct. The Examiner has based this conclusion on alleged material (biological, chemical or functional) differences between compositions, or alleged differences in the materials and modes of operation required for methods. However, Applicants submit that the Examiner has not established that a serious burden would result from a search of the invention groups together. Applicants do not believe that the Examiner has fulfilled the requirements for a proper claim restriction based on a serious burden standard. Applicants believe that a search of any one of Invention groups I through VI would produce results that would encompass the subject matter of each of the invention groups. Thus, a serious burden would not be placed on the Examiner in order to conduct a search and examination of the claims of Inventions I through VI.

Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the claims of Invention I and Inventions IV-VI are patentably distinct in that the inventions are drawn to materially distinct compositions and methods that are not related. In particular, the Examiner asserts that the compositions of Invention I and Inventions IV-VI are biologically, chemically and functionally distinct from each other. Applicants disagree with the Examiner’s conclusion in that the subject matter of Invention I and Inventions IV-VI are closely related. Thus, the additional burden of a separate search or examination would not be required.

The Examiner also asserts that the claims of Invention II and Invention III are patentably distinct in that the inventions are drawn to methods that require different starting materials and modes of operation. Applicants disagree with the Examiner’s conclusion in that the inventions are related. In particular, the inventions relate to methods of using a PERK disrupted cell to identify agents that modulate PERK. The methods require the same or closely related steps and modes of operation. Applicants submit that a reasonable search or examination of the prior art on this subject would produce results encompassing the subject matter of both invention groups, and would not put serious burden on the Examiner.

Finally, the Examiner asserts that the claims of Inventions I, and IV-VI and Inventions II and III are patentably distinct because the inventions are unrelated, and have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects. Applicants disagree with the Examiner's conclusion. Applicants believe that a reasonable search of the prior art, *e.g.* a search based on PERK disruptions, would produce results related to each of the invention groups. A search and examination of the claims of each of these inventions can therefore be made without additional burden on the Examiner.

Although Applicants have provisionally elected Invention I for the purposes of advancing prosecution of the present application, Applicants contend for the foregoing reasons that the requirement for restriction between Inventions I through VI is improper. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the requirement.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/10/03

Kelly L. Quast  
Kelly L. Quast (Reg. No. 52,141)

Deltagen, Inc.  
740 Bay Road  
Redwood City, CA 94063  
(650) 569-5100

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 CFR 1.8**

I hereby certify that this correspondence and its listed enclosures is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail, postage paid, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231 on **March 10, 2003**

Name: **Deborah A. Mojarro**

Signed: Deborah A. Mojarro

Date: 3/10/03